SUMMARY OF UNE RATE CALCULATIONS

1. Dedicated Transport (Lines 1-24). These values were derived according to the following methodology:

    a. We first replicated, from the workpapers supplied by Verizon, the monthly recurring and per-mile charges for DS-1 interoffice transport.

    b. We then created adjusted charges for DS-1 interoffice transport by changing the Verizon proposed fill rate from 50% to 60%, utilizing adjusted annual charge factors based our findings herein.

    c. We then applied the ratio of our adjusted charges for DS-1 interoffice transport to the charges for DS-1 interoffice transport proposed by Verizon. This yielded a value of 57% for the fixed rate and 59% for the per mile rate.

    d. These values were then applied to Verizon's proposed transport values. That is, anywhere in the UNE Spreadsheet that there was a proposed value for fixed transport, Verizon's proposed rate was multiplied by 57% and anywhere in the UNE Spreadsheet that there was a proposed value for per mile transport, Verizon's proposed rate was multiplied by 59%.

2. Tandem trunk ports (Lines 27-40). We adopted the rates we calculated using the methodology discussed in the Switching section of the Order, after making all of the modifications discussed therein. The values were derived as follows:

    a. Changes were made to the METELRC.xls workbook provided by Verizon. The changes made in this workbook were to the annual charge factors in the input tab of this workbook. The annual charge factors utilized by Verizon were replaced by those we calculated. Adjusting these annual charge factors gave us the following adjusted values for the Tandem:

        i. Trunk Ports-per Trunk

        ii. Trunk Ports - per MOU, and;

        iii. Usage - per MOU

b. We then compared the original Tandem values in METELRC.xls Tandem tab with the Tandem values Proposed by Verizon in their 271 Rate Summary sheet. If there was a difference between these two values, we created a ratio by taking our adjusted METELRC values and dividing those by Verizon's original METELRC values. This ratio was then applied against Verizon's proposed values as contained in the 271 Rate Summary sheet.[1]

c. The ratio was not applied to the Port Charges as the port charges contained in Verizon's original METELRC.xls were the same as those appearing in their 271 Rate Summary Sheet. So, for Tandem port we utilized our adjusted number as derived according to 2.a.

3. 2-wire analog loops and all xDSL related loops (Lines 43-47, 103-109, 121-149, 161-165). We adopted the rates we calculated using Verizon's model after making all of the modifications discussed in the Loop section of the Order.

4. Other loops (Lines 51-165, excluding those described in No. 3 above). We adopted the average rate.

5. Loop qualification charges (Lines 169-201). We adopted Verizon's proposed monthly recurring charge. For all NRCs, we applied the 65% reduction factor discussed in the NRC section of the Examiner's Report.

6. Line ports (Lines 205-315) – We adopted the rates we calculated using the methodology discussed in the Switching section of the Examiner's Report, after making all of the modifications discussed therein.

7, Feature change etc. (Line 317-325). We applied the 65% NRC reduction factor for NRCs.

8. AIN Triggers (Lines 327-331). We used the Verizon proposed rate for line 327 because it was lower than the average of Massachusetts and Rhode Island. (Upon further review, the Vermont entry appears to be typographical error.) We used the average of Massachusetts and Rhode Island for line 331 because again, upon further review, the Vermont entry appears to be typographical error.

9. SS7 Features (Lines 336-433). We adopted a $0 rate because of our finding that all of these functionalities are included in the cost of the switch.

---

[1]This procedure was done because, while we have electronic copies of Verizon's model and some of Baker's workpapers, Verizon relied upon updated versions of Baker's work papers in its filed rate calculations. We do not have electronic copies of these workpapers and so do not know precisely how the revised values were derived.

10.   Trunk ports (Lines 443-479). For the per port rates, we took the unbundled local switching line port rate we derived from our switching calculations, at cell H205 in the UNE tab, divided this value by the value proposed by Verizon, at cell C205, and then took this ratio and multiplied it against Verizon's proposed per port rates for the trunk port.

        For the per-MOU rates, we took the unbundled local switching per MOU rate we derived from our switching calculations, at cell H487 in the UNE tab, divided this value by the value proposed by Verizon, at cell C487, and then took this ratio and multiplied it against Verizon's proposed per MOU rates for trunk ports.

11.   Switching (Lines 484-503). We used the Gabel Kennedy data to derive these rates as described in the Order.

12.   Transport (Lines 505-576). These values were derived in the same described in No. 1 above.

13.   Tandem Transit switching (Lines 578-583). We could not find the cost study for tandem transit switching. Accordingly, we took Verizon's proposed rate for tandem transit switching and multiplied it by the following ratio:

        a.   The tandem switching rates we calculated for Verizon's tandem switching (cell H38), divided by Verizon's proposed tandem switching rates (cell C38).

14.   AIN Development and Service (Lines 584-605). For NRCs, we applied the 65% reduction factor. For the rest of the rates, we adopted the average rate except Service Creation Usage where we used the average of Massachusetts and Rhode Island because Vermont entry appears to be typographical error.

15.   EBS (Line 608). We adopted the Massachusetts rate because we could not take an average or calculate the rate ourselves.

16.   NIDs (Line 611-621). We adopted the average rates. This means that Verizon needs to conform how it is offering/charging for this UNE in Maine to how it is offered/charged in other states.[2]

17.   House and Riser (Lines 622-642) We adopted state average rate except where Verizon proposal was lower and there we adopted the Verizon-

---

[2] We believe we discovered and corrected an error in Verizon's table. Specifically, in cell c665 the $77.37 rate is the time and materials rate for the first 30 minutes per occasion and the $18.59 in cell c671 applies to all subsequent 30 minute periods for the same occasion. So, time and materials for the NID is $77.37 for the first 30 minutes and then $18.59 each 30 minute period after that. The other states have this set up to charge for 15 minute periods instead of 30.

proposed rates. For all NRCs related to House and Riser, we applied the 65% reduction factor discussed in the NRC section of the Order.

18. EEL Test Link (Lines 643-743). We adopted state average rate except where the Verizon proposal was lower and there we adopted Verizon-proposed rates.

19, EEL Voice Grade DSO Transport (Lines 745-748). We applied the methodology outlined in No. 1 above. That is, Verizon's proposed rate for Monthly - Fixed - Per VG/DS0 channel was multiplied by 57% and Verizon's proposed rate for Monthly - Per mile - Per VG/DS0 channel was multiplied by 59%.

20. Dark Fiber (Lines 750-804). We adopted the state average rate except where Verizon's proposal was lower and there we adopted the Verizon-proposed rates. For all NRCs, we applied the 65% reduction factor. For interoffice transport, we adopted the methodology described in No. 1 above.

21. TOPIC (Line 805). We adopted the average rate which is also Verizon's proposed rate.

22. USLA sub-loops (Lines 821-842). We adopted the state average rate.

23. Lines Sharing Test Access (Line 845). We adopted the state average.